R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 020 925 TE 000 519

GOALS, CONCEPTS, AND THE TEACHER OF SPEECH.

BY- WALLACE, KARL R.

PUB DATE MAR 68

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.52 11P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SPEECH EDUCATION, *EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES, *SPEECH, *RHETORIC, SECONDARY EDUCATION, ELEMENTARY EDUCATION, COLLEGE INSTRUCTION, LANGUAGE, LANGUAGE ARTS, COMMUNICATION SKILLS, GENERAL EDUCATION, SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, ENGLISH INSTRUCTION, LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT, LANGUAGE SKILLS, TEACHERS,

LIKE MANY OTHER DISCIPLINES, THE FIELD OF SPEECH IS IN NEED OF A REAPPRAISAL AND DEFINITION OF ITS CENTRAL GOALS AND FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS. ON THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LEVEL, ALL TEACHERS ARE LANGUAGE TEACHERS BECAUSE LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IS CRUCIAL TO THE LEARNING PROCESS AND TO THE SOCIAL GROWTH OF THE YOUNG CHILD. ON THE SECONDARY LEVEL, THE SPEECH TEACHER ATTEMPTS, IN CONJUNCTION WITH OTHER SPECIALISTS, TO AID THE STUDENT IN BECOMING CONGNIZANT OF AND CONTROLLING COMMUNICATION AS AN EXPERIENCE CENTRAL TO THE REALIZATION OF FAMILY, VOCATIONAL, AND PROFESSIONAL GOALS. FINALLY, ON THE COLLEGE LEVEL, SPEECH DEPARTMENTS PROVIDE A TRAINING GROUND FOR SPECIALISTS IN THIS DISCIPLINE AND PLAY AN IMPORTANT PART IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF ARTICULATE HUMANISTS. (THIS ARTICLE APPEARED IN "THE SPEEECH TEACHER, " VOL. 17 (MARCH 1968), 91-100.) (DL)

The Speech Teacher

VOLUME XVII · MARCH 1968 · No. 2

The SPEECH TEACHER

MARCH, 1968 VOL. XVII, No. 2

Karl R. Wallace

GOALS, CONCEPTS, AND THE TEACHER OF SPEECH

IN addressing this audience I have two motives in mind. I want first to remind college professors of speech, rhetoric, and communication that their professional welfare depends upon the fate of instruction in speech and language in the public schools. Their welfare will be determined by the response to this fundamental question: Will everybody concerned with the education of the child recognize the central, indispensable role of language behavior in the intellectual, emotional, and social development of the child? With this problem I am not directly concerned today. My second motive is to suggest that if teachers of speech are to exert any real influence, if they are to have any real power, in the education of children they must think rigorously about what they are teaching and what they should teach. Today I am talking to teachers of speech primarily. But as you will see later I don't want to exclude teachers having kinship with us; for example, teachers of the language arts, the communication arts, or teachers of communication and rhetoric. I am especially interested in those who teach in the elementary grades, although I shall not ignore the high school and college teacher. In brief, I am concerned with any teacher whose chief interest is suggested by the concepts, speech and language, the teacher who is committed to the belief that speech and language are the indispensable media and means through which the child and the adolescent develop as human beings and as effective social beings. I am not directly concerned today with teachers of remedial speech, radio and television, and of dramatics and theatre. Their problems, both pedagogical and professional, are less acute and less ambiguous than those of the teacher of public speech, rhetoric, discussion, and oral interpretation. Their goals, their methods, and their materials are easily seen by the school administrator and the parental public. And by and large, they are recognized as specialists and have won considerable autonomy. On the other hand, it is not easy for the layman to recognize the product of the teacher of speech, unless it be viewed in the context of the speech festival or competitive performance.

In pointing to the need to appraise ourselves as teachers of speech, I am

Karl R. Wallace is Professor of Speech and Head of the Department of Speech at the University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois. He has served as editor of the *Quarterly Journal of Speech* (1945-1947) and as President (1954) of the association. The present article is printed here as it was presented at the conventions of Central States Speech Association, Indianapolis, Indiana, April 14, 1967, and the New England States Speech Association, October 20, 1967.

taking a national point of view, rather than a local one. Much is going on in local school systems and in state speech associations that I know nothing of. Such knowledge as I have derives, mainly though not solely, from experience with national committees and groups during the past few years.

Teachers of speech on a national scale have never been forced to take a hard look at themselves as have teachers of English. Everyone remembers the furore over Johnny-can't-read. Reading and writing have always been regarded as essential to the acquisition of knowledge in the natural and social sciences, in history, philosophy, and literature. Speaking has not—at least not the kind of speaking that has to be studied systematically. Among other things, competence in oral communication is not an academic achievement in the public schools, nor in the colleges. The graduates of our schools and colleges are supposed to be able to write acceptably, but not to speak acceptably. In short, oral communication, and the teachers thereof, have never become a national problem. Because we have not represented a requirement for graduation, we have become, each in his own special setting, the principal judge of his own teaching. This kind of situation could persist because nobody outside ourselves either was required to, or was interested in, taking a critical look at our activities. On the other hand, teachers of English confessed their sins. They said they could improve their teaching of composition and grammar in the public schools, particularly if the federal government would supply funds for a national effort to upgrade teachers in service, to improve the preparation of teachers in training, and to set national guidelines and standards. Some of the consequences we all know about. There are scores of teachers institutes, sponsored and managed by the National Council of Teachers of English. A few of the institutes have been devoted to the teaching of speech. There have been established, also, national guidelines for the preparation of English teachers. Their establishment represents the joint efforts of NCTE, the Modern Language Association, and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification. These organizations, it should be noted, combine the talents and experience of two very large and powerful groups: on the one hand, teachers in the elementary school, teachers of high school English, and teachers of college English; and on the other hand, state certification officials—officials who decide whether a teacher qualifies for union membership. In the regional conferences devoted to the discussion of the guidelines, teachers of speech occasionally participated as consultants.[1]

It may be said, then, that English teachers have been forced into self-appraisal. It can be said, I think, that teachers of speech have not, at least not on a national scale. Had we suffered a national crisis, had the public yelled that Johnny couldn't speak, we would long ago have had to agonize over our pedagogical character, have asked ourselves what we are, what we teach, why we teach it, and whether we ought to teach something else.

Now in making this statement I am mindful that as a group, teachers of speech have not been uncritical of themselves nor undisturbed over their professional status. Of these states of mind there are many signs and for this audience they need only be alluded to. Many of our state speech associations have been, and still are, concerned with public school teaching and with its methods,

[1] "English Teacher Preparation Study: Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English." *PMLA*, LXXXII (October 1967), 3-8.

materials, standards, teacher preparation and certification. For years SAA has fostered committees and interest groups devoted to the improvement and welfare of speech instruction in the elementary and secondary school. As teachers, then, we know that we can do better.

Yet what we have been trying to do is not enough. In our local settings, some of us may have clear images of ourselves; if we do, we have not built them into a national image. Our failure to do so lies in the limited and confined view we have of our role in the total enterprise of the school, the total education of the child, and the relationship of our role to the roles of other teachers of other subjects. Clear as our local portraits may be, there is some evidence that they lack perspective, breadth, and depth. This judgment, I believe, is as applicable to teachers of English as it is to teachers of speech. Let me point to a few signs.

My first sign is taken from the efforts of SAA and its Secondary School Interest Group to construct a new course of study in speech for national use in the high school. The intent is to modernize the present plan and outline of study, published in 1959 and endorsed by SAA. Discussions, informal and formal, have gone on for over three years. In the summer of 1966, a task force was assembled, consisting of veteran teachers and persons experienced in the preparation of teachers, meeting to determine the final shape and structure of the new course. The materials submitted to the task force consisted of suggestions, proposals, units and plans of instruction coming from outstanding teachers of long experience. They revealed a great variety of instructional goals, methods, and practices, couched in concepts that were often highly ambiguous if not unclear. In searching for something that might represent a national point of view toward speech education, the task force encountered the greatest trouble in defining central ideals and concepts. One is led to infer, therefore, that difficult as it may be to see clearly what we do teach and why, it is infinitely more difficult to decide upon what we ought to teach, and why. The basic difficulty, I believe, is that we cannot seem to see our goals clearly, and we do not see clearly because we cannot, or will not, define our fundamental concepts, the concepts that define ourselves.

My second sign is familiar to all members of SAA—so familiar that I need only remark that we have had trouble with the name by which we want to be nationally known. Is our character better revealed through the symbol *speech,* or *communication?* What *is* our nature? Additional evidence of our conceptual troubles is to be seen in the difficulties of establishing a satisfactory national achievement test for the college major in speech. There have been two versions of the test, developed by the Educational Testing Service and a national panel of speech experts chosen by ourselves. Discussion leading to the first version started 25 years ago. The second version is now in limited use among graduate schools of speech. A third version is in preparation. In the effort to build a test that can be widely used, the trouble lies not in the meanings of technical terms appearing in the specialized, scientific areas of our field; the trouble lies in the broad concepts and categories with which we talk about rhetoric, oral interpretation, speech education, speech behavior, speech fundamentals, and the like. To put the difficulty sharply there is simply no widespread understanding and acceptance of our intellectual tools.

I shall now note but one more sign of conceptual troubles among teachers. It is drawn from my occasional associations with teachers of English, and from their attempts to find a concept descriptive of a public school program—a program dominated by a single, intelligible goal, namely, that of improving the speech and English language skills of the child and adolescent. I am impressed that English teachers as well as speech teachers are touchy about the labels they are willing to live by. They see that the term "English" is "untidy and amorphous." They have re-discovered the full implications of the term "rhetoric" and have become concerned about the boundary lines between rhetoric and literature. Wayne Booth, for example, has been asking whether much of fiction, if not all of it, is not rhetorical in purpose and effect. Many teachers of English dislike "speech," "communication," and "communication skills," partly because they remember their unfortunate days when they tried to teach courses in the communication skills and found themselves unprepared. They adore literature and love to teach it. The large majority of them dislike "composition," and when they are sentenced to teaching it they squeeze as much literature into writing courses as they can. Some literary cultists—and indeed some cultists in the fine arts generally—detest "communication," and worship "expression," and "creativity." The literati spurn "linguistics," and take an olympian attitude toward "semantics." (After all, a poem *is*.) Many teachers of speech are violently allergic to "expression" and "elocution." Some of them, working in the elementary and secondary schools, privately think of themselves as teachers of rhetoric or of communication, yet prefer publicly the label "language arts." On many occasions I have been amazed, amused, and distressed by the irrational responses of professors of the humanities to such words and concepts. What are we to infer from such behavior? Of course, much of the puzzlement, confusion, and ultrasensitivity springs from ignorance —ignorance of the history of our central concepts and consequent uncertainty of their meanings in both experimental and pedagogical contexts. I infer, also, that the failure to embrace a professional label wholeheartedly, together with confusion over related concepts, signifies the failure to identify one's professional self. We cannot escape from the nomothetic label and we cannot evade by glibly saying that labels don't count. They *do* count, for they represent a person's deepest commitments, his *public* commitments. So I must ask: Do we know who we really are? And if we don't have an identity, what is it that we think we are teaching?

I don't fully understand why we do not tackle our basic concepts, probe their meanings, and lay them out for all to see. A proposal to examine the concepts of rhetoric has been before the executive powers of SAA and NCTE for two years. Perhaps analytical study of this kind is not amenable to a broad program of coordinated research and has to depend upon the interests of individuals. Some individuals, it is true, have undertaken probings, chiefly the empiricists and experimentalists among us. There have been new insights into ethos and aspects of style, and some work on the nature of persuasion. It is ironical, however, that the best analytical examination of the concept of persuasion has come from a philosopher. Forty years ago the philosophers knew that their professional future depended on the ability to find their indispensable, central concepts and to define them clearly. Are scholars in the field of speech less perceptive than those in

the field of analytical philosophy? Do they feel inferior to the task of rigorous, abstract analysis?

If the teacher of speech wants to develop a clear image of his professional self, he must understand the central and indispensable role of speech and language behavior in the educational development of the child. There is a way, and perhaps only one proper way, of thinking about this matter. First, the educational growth and development of the human being from the kindergartener to the college graduate is a complex case of a change in behavior. The kindergarten child presents the teacher with one kind of human state or set of conditions, the college senior with another set of conditions. There is thus a beginning point and an end point. The clearer each is defined the better. The transition from one point to the other is a process of change in which the kindergartener becomes the college graduate, or if the change be less extensive and of another kind, the kindergartener becomes a high school graduate. Second, any process involving change of this kind is, in the final analysis, described in terms of ends or goals, materials, form and methods, and the agent of change. The agent is the teacher, and the teacher is the controlling force, or the point of control in the process. All other kinds of individuals in the educational establishment—administrators, custodians, even students—exist for him. Third, there are different kinds of teachers. Together they are responsible for the total education of the child; separately, each is responsible for that aspect of behavior change for which he is certified to possess a special competence. The change he desires in behavior is described in terms of special ends or goals, special materials, special forms and methods, of which he is the architect.

The kind of analysis which the teacher of speech and language undertakes is almost self-evident. Let me swiftly indicate the points of analysis for the change from K through 12, keeping in mind that within the generic change desired for K-12 there seem to be distinct species of change for K-6, for grades 7 through 9, and for grades 10 through 12. Nevertheless, the same set of questions applies to each level and kind of change. First, what is the general, the final *goal,* i.e., the kind of person, to be realized upon graduation from the high school? What kind of speech behavior is he expected to be good at—if indeed any? Is he to be good at expressive, creative discourse? at communicative discourse? and in both informal and formal situations? What are the goals at the level of grade 9? and of grade 6? Are they more general, or less general, than the goals at grade 12? And to what extent, if at all, is it possible to separate the child's general development from his development in speech and language behavior? Once the goals are clearly characterized, one can direct attention to ways and means of achieving them. Here again the basic questions are self-evident. What *materials* are appropriate to the achievement of each goal? And in what forms, methods, projects, and the like, do the materials appear?

In this scheme of analysis, I am inclined to think that goals, materials, and substance are more important than forms and methods. Why? The answer is too long, complicated, and philosophical to attempt now. I observe only that if one keeps utility in mind, or keeps in mind the relationship of means to end, it is apparent that form and method serve end and material. It is not the other way around; material does not serve form, nor does the end or purpose of behavior exist for the sake of

the form of behavior. I am not, for example, communicating an idea in order to show you the form of saying it. (If there are times when form does not serve substance, it may be in so-called aesthetic behavior—say in music and painting—in which materials or subject matter may indeed be subordinate to, and in the service of, form, and in which the outcome of the experience is fun and pleasure.)

In public school education it is customary to think of three kinds of grade levels, that from the kindergarten through grade 6—the elementary grades; from grade 7 through grade 9—the junior high grades; and from grade 10 through grade 12; the senior high school years. Each of these levels corresponds with developmental levels in the growth of the child, and each developmental level must have its appropriate goals. In the elementary grades are two kinds of teachers. First are those who preside over reading and writing, skills which are based on the child's speech and which teachers say can be taught only through speech. Indeed, the teacher of language skills is the dominant figure in grades K-3, although he may label himself simply as an "elementary" teacher. At about grade 3 and thereafter other kinds of teachers appear—those who introduce the child to the materials and operations of what are usually called social studies, science, mathematics, music, art, and literature. When all kinds of teachers in the first six grades look to their task, they acknowledge goals of two general kinds. Their ultimate goal is the development of a child—a whole child. They are building a person, not a specialist in science, or mathematics, or literature, or art. They are, moreover, building a *social* being—a person who must live agreeably and acceptably with other persons, a person who cannot choose to live alone on a desert island. The more immediate goal of the elementary teacher is that of preparing the child to function well in grades 7-9, to engage effectively in adolescent learning in the high school, and to mature as an adult. In going about their tasks, teachers recognize—or *should* recognize—that the learning experience is managed predominantly through language. They see that language behavior must be intelligible and meaningful in a dialogue in which teacher communicates with teacher, teacher with learner, and learner with learner. They may perceive that the information to which the child is exposed and the experience he gains in the classroom, hour by hour, day by day, are integrated and solidified in language behavior. What they may not see clearly is that the activity in which they are involved constantly and necessarily is best described as acts of *communication*. With the learning experience and the communicative experience thus related, teachers can readily perceive that in building a social being the materials of learning are the materials of communication. Whatever materials are judged to be *worth* learning are materials *worth* communicating. Hence, in the elementary grades, the materials and general goals of communication are primary; the forms of communication are subsidiary. In elementary education the focus is on the materials of communication; in education thereafter the emphasis shifts gradually to the communication of materials.

Where does the teacher of speech and language appear in this scene? At the point at which communication and expression can be recognized as distinct kinds of experiences by the child. At the stage of growth at which it is desirable to establish *control* over the social development of the child; at the

stage of selfhood and self-awareness when the child recognizes the dawning of his *public* self as well as his *private* self. I suggest that in both elementary and secondary education, the social goals are the development of the private self and the public self and the obligation to be responsible for each. The teacher of technical subject matters and skills serves both selves. The teacher of speech and language then appears in two forms: the teacher of literature who serves primarily the private self and its pleasures; and the teacher of communication, a specialist in rhetorical discourse, who serves primarily the public self and its desires. In any event and under whatever label may be acknowledged in a particular school setting, the teacher of speech and language is expert at getting the child to learn that there is such a thing as communicative experience, that there are kinds of it, each with purposes, materials, and forms, and that it is important to establish control over them. The speech-language teacher is a specialist at inventing learning experiences in communication and at appraising their effectiveness. At what point in the grades can he begin to operate as a specialist? We have little reliable information on this matter, yet we know that in one fourth-grade setting among "underprivileged" children, students recognized the difference between general and specific words and statements and in their own writing could construct passages developed from the general idea to the specific. The point at which children become aware of form and structure should demand the presence and influence of the teacher of speech and language in his proper, professional role. He is, as it were, a specialist in the forms of speech and discourse. Yet as a specialist of this sort he above all other teachers acts upon the premise that form is in the service of meaning and the communication of meaning. This in fact is what he himself illustrates and what he really teaches.

If teachers of the kinds we have mentioned can perceive their essential roles in the educational enterprise, they will not be arbitrarily possessive about subject matter territories. The teacher of speech and the teacher of science through at least nine grades unite in educating the whole child, the expert in science introducing the child to his materials and symbols and the expert in speech and language helping the child to incorporate some of the same symbols into relevant communicative contexts. Through such cooperative esdeavor in the schools, both teachers and learners gradually understand that the ends of technology and communication differ in some ways and that their symbols and meanings, as well as their procedures, differ also. They come to understand—or should understand—that the meanings and values shared by all, that become the property of every child's state of being, are the commonplaces of living. These are the materials and experiences that make communication possible, that make communication successful, and that make cooperative living a reality. It is too bad that the word commonplace has come to imply the worn and the obvious, because it is only in terms of the old and the familiar that the new becomes intelligible and escapes being nonsense.

It appears to me, then, that the soundest way, the most fundamental way, of viewing education up to the age of thirteen or fourteen is to think of the child as a changing, developing human being who must learn as well as he can to become an acceptable social being first and a technician second. At stake is the child's general equipment

for living and for moving farther up the spiral of growth and change. At the heart of the process of schooling and at the heart of human growth are expressive and communicative activities in which speech behavior is central and other kinds of symbolic behavior are necessary and supportive. To deny this is to imply that the human being is not a social creature, that the individual qua individual can learn in the absence of others, in the absence of teachers, and in the absence of symbolic systems. It is to imply, too, that the best learning is spontaneous and random.

Obviously we have little time to deal with speech education at the levels of high school and college. Yet something should be said. First, during late adolescence in the mid-high school years young people become aware of general goals and of kinds of information and materials that anticipate the mature man and woman. During the college years the general goals usually become more specific and the materials of learning more special. Goals reflect the desire to become independent of parents, to seek economic security and comfort, to establish a new family unit, and to realize, each person for himself according to his ability, the satisfactions associated with prestige, esteem, and self-respect. To achieve these goals is to acquire the special knowledge, methods, and skills found in modern business life, the professions, and in industrial management and research. If young people develop images of themselves in their family, vocational, and professional roles, the image should include man as communicator, as well as man as parent, breadwinner, and leader. The endeavor of the teacher of speech, then, seems to be clear: to lock into the emerging goals of adolescence and maturity the desire to communicate well, and to build learning situations in which specialized knowledge and materials become the substance of planned discourse and discussion. Communication thus becomes essential to the arts and professions; it is part of the texture of things, not an odd piece of bright yarn tied on somewhere if the weaver happens to like it. Appearing first in the high school and later developed more fully in the college will be instruction in informative and persuasive discourse, in public speaking, in group discussion and conference. Appearing also as the student becomes more sophisticated are the study and criticism of examples of practical discourse. It is during these years, then, that the teachers of special subject matters and the teacher of communication join forces to serve the needs of specialized man. Both kinds of teachers recognize that the arts of discourse are essential. One kind emphasizes the materials of the maturing learner, the other emphasizes the learner who uses materials in communication. As a result of such a union of teachers and their learners comes a discovery that is fundamental to personal and professional success and happiness. Specialized man faces two problems in communication. He constantly confronts his own kind from whom he derives his sense of fraternity and wins professional respect. With this audience he must communicate effectively. He confronts also his nonspecialized fellows from whom he derives his economic success and wins family and community esteem. With this audience he must communicate intelligibly and persuasively. The learner finds out that the professional self is achieved through his specialized language; he discovers that the social and cultural self is achieved through the ordinary language. This includes the language of literature. There is often

added another sort of language, say that of music.

I shall make but one other observation about the function of instruction in speech in the advanced years of formal education. There are young people who want to teach speech, communication, English composition, or the language arts. Their professional goal is responsible in part for the appearance in the college curriculum of special courses whose titles carry words such as rhetoric, speech, linguistics, phonetics, communications, speech pathology, audiology, the oral interpretation of literature, theatre, television, acting, directing, scene design, and the like. Such courses are in part also the response to a few students whose goal is simply knowledge for the sake of knowledge. They want to find out all they can about speech and language behavior in any or all of its manifestations—its meanings, its structures, and its uses. They are deeply curious about what makes human beings human. There is, finally, another kind of student with another kind of goal. I shall call him a humanist. He is the person who discovers that the fullest realization of himself comes through his ability to communicate with his fellows—to talk with them freely, frankly, with ease and confidence, in the spirit of learning, advice, and counsel. He knows that the integrity of the private self is a function of the social, cultural, and political self. He knows that the parent and citizen speak a language different from that of the technician and scientist. It is the ordinary language; it is the words and meanings the common language accumulates as a result of study, experience, and familiarity with the full range of subject matters that are held to comprise the equipment of educated men. The subject matters are brought to a focus, they are made viable and effective, as every student of rhetoric knows, in the give and take of human intercourse when reliable information is at issue, when views are interpreted and explained, when responsible choices must be made, and rival arguments be accommodated to the business at hand. For the humanist, systematic study and practice in the arts of public discourse are as important to his behavior and influence among men as instruction in speech is to the child. What he learns in his general, nontechnical courses in school and college is integrated, controlled, refined, and made effective through language. His experience becomes more abstract and subtle, its meanings extended and enriched, his behavior more ready and adaptable to the requirements of effective thought and action in a free society. Most college teachers fail to recognize that the vitality of general education depends on learning through communication, and most teachers of practical discourse are slow to make the ideas and values taught through general education the substance of communication. It is sad to contemplate how seldom do general education teachers and teachers of rhetoric see their common goal as the making of humanists.

As a final observation, let me call attention again to a name I have been using—the teacher of speech and language. This general term implies the true function of teachers in the elementary grades who may regard themselves as teachers of English, or speech, or the Language Arts, or as teachers of writing and reading, speaking and listening. For these teachers I have no neat label. Their identity, as I have suggested, will come through recognition of common goals and common materials. But for the teacher of speech and language in grades 7-12, there is a good name. It is Rhetoric. I admit read-

ily to the cry of bias. Yet perceived in its widest setting, both in classical and modern times, rhetoric embraces all that can be said about the art, the science, and the teaching of speech and language behavior in communicative settings. Rightly understood it centers attention on the materials, substance, and meanings involved essentially in communication without minimizing or maximizing style and delivery. Among the studies of the old trivium, rhetoric was the substantial art; grammar and logic were the formal ones. Modern educators should see clearly that the problem in language instruction is how to enmesh content and form, substance and technique, idea and figure in situations appropriate for language learning and development. Grammar and linguistics offer knowledge of the forms and structures of utterances, logic supplies the knowledge of forms of inferential patterns. Rhetoric reveals what is going on when the materials of thought are at work in living discourse, when a communicative situation uniting speaker and audience brings forth substantial, systematic utterance.

The word "rhetoric" also holds a strategic advantage. It enjoys some respect among all teachers who wish to emphasize composition rather than literature. There are, then some teachers who are aware of common goals and materials. If they wished they could call themselves teachers of rhetoric; if they preferred the labels English and speech, they could still find in rhetoric their essential educational identity. The high school could discover that instruction in speech is something more than a frill and that there is a place for special courses that focus on speech behavior and the speech arts, courses offered separately from the customary four-year sequence called English."

From the ideal point of view, sustained instruction in the English language through the three or four years of high school should constitute the dominant core of study and claim prime respect and effort. Whatever the core classes be named, their central concepts should be those of the arts of rhetoric and communication and the arts of literary interpretation, including the art of theatre. Instruction should be designed by teachers and carried out by teachers who respect these arts, understand them, and want to teach them. If some be labelled teachers of English and some teachers of speech, what does it matter as long as the learner be devotedly served? This position, let me emphasize, is an ideal one, a goal worth working for, a goal to be achieved some day. Whether the goal can be approximated in the next few years in a particular school will depend on the interests and the preparation of teachers in English, speech, and the social sciences. (Who knows enough about rhetoric, communication, speech and language behavior, child psychology, logic and semantics, political science and social psychology, the history and criticism of literature and public address, to get started? Are there teachers who are competent in some of these knowledges and who are willing to teach each other? Can team instruction be managed, each teacher being responsible for what he knows best?) What is required above all are teachers of speech and language who see their goals clearly and who are deeply committed to the materials of communication and the communication of materials.

Johnny deserves a better fortune than he has had. But I am afraid he will not get it through the efforts of the teacher of English alone or the teacher of speech alone, for these teachers cannot understand Johnny if they do not understand themselves.